

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed November 8, 2010. Reconsideration of this application in view of the below remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 3 – 6 and 30 – 41 are pending in the application, with Claims 3, 30, 32, 36 and 38 being in independent form. By the present amendment, Claims 3, 30, 32, 36 and 38 are amended to include features shown in, for example, FIG. 5 and 29 of the disclosure as originally filed. Therefore, no new subject matter is introduced into the disclosure by way of the present amendment.

I. Rejection of Claims 3 – 6 and 30 – 41 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 3 – 6 and 30 – 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6, 222,583 issued to Matsumoto et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,014,608 issued to Seo, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0113872 (hereinafter, “Kinjo”).

Neither Matsumoto et al. nor Seo, taken alone or in any proper combination, discloses using time information, e.g. time table or diagram, etc., in combination with position information to identify an object that cannot be identified by positional information alone. (See: Applicants’ page 19, lines 13 – 22). The Examiner contends that Kinjo discloses using time information.

Kinjo discloses identifying a subject of an image being taken with a camera based on GPS and azimuth angle information of the camera. The camera then transmits the GPS and azimuth angle information, as well as any information regarding the subject of the image, to a database organization. The database organization uses the GPS and azimuth angle information to determine the geographic position and identity of the subject. In addition, Kinjo discloses that

moving objects, such as trains and automobiles may provide position information, including time information, to the database organization.

However, Kinjo does not disclose or suggest using the time information to estimate a position of an object and identify the recognized object on a display, as recited in amended Claims 3, 30, 32, 36 and 38. Rather, the time information is provided by the moving object to the database organization so that when the subject of an image is identified as the moving object the position and time information can be transmitted to the camera, i.e. message sender, as information about the subject. (See: paragraph [0053]). Thus, the object's time information is provided to the camera only after the object has already been identified. Therefore, in Kinjo the time information cannot be used to estimate the position of an object in order to recognize whether or not the object is present in the captured video, and subsequently identify the recognized object on a display based on the time information.

Moreover, Kinjo uses time information to extract the position of a known object in a world coordinate reference frame, and uses the position in comparison with the position in the world coordinate reference frame at which the camera is aimed.

In contrast, the present invention uses the time information of known objects to estimate the position of an object in an image coordinate reference frame (i.e., “positional information within the captured video image of the object”) and uses the time information to recognize the presence of the known object at the position in the image coordinate reference frame.

Consequently, Matsumoto et al., Seo, and Kinjo, taken alone or in any proper combination, do not disclose or suggest an “...estimating means for estimating a position of an object in a captured video image from positional information within said captured video image of

said object, moving speed information of a video input unit providing said captured video image, and image capturing information including time information for determining an area where an image will be captured...and identification means for identifying said object recognized as present in said captured video image based on a correlation of said positional information of said object and said time information with known objects ...” as recited in Applicants’ amended Claim 3, and similarly recited in amended Claims 30, 32, 36 and 38.

Therefore, for at least the reasons presented above, Claims 3 – 6 and 30 – 41 are believed to be allowable over the cited prior art references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 3 – 6 and 30 – 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Matsumoto et al. in view of Seo, and further in view of Kinjo.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 3 – 6 and 30 – 41 are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Applicant's undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
/Paul J. Esatto, Jr./
Paul J. Esatto, Jr.
Registration No. 30,749

Scully, Scott, Murphy, & Presser, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343
PJE/DAT:jam